



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,960	09/22/2003	Graham Neil McKelvey	CM263IMC	1194
27752	7590	03/29/2006	EXAMINER	
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161 6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE CINCINNATI, OH 45224			ELHILO, EISA B	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1751		
DATE MAILED: 03/29/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/667,960	MCKELVEY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eisa B. Elhilo	1751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

- 1 This action is responsive to the amendment filed on January 18, 2006.
- 2 Claims 1 and 8-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dias et al. (US' 355) for the reasons set forth in the previous office action mailed on July 18, 2005.
- 3 Claims 2-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dias et al. (US' 355) in view of Peter et al. (US' 918) for the reasons set forth in the previous office action mailed on July 18, 2005.
- 4 Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dias et al. (US' 355) in view of Peese et al. (US' 478) for the reasons set forth in the previous office action mailed on July 18, 2005.

Response to Applicant's Arguments

- 5 Applicant's arguments filed 1/18/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the rejection of claims 1 and 8-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dias et al. (US' 355), Applicant argues that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness because Dias et al. does not recognize the level of chelant to be result-effective with respect to reducing oxidative damage to hair during bleaching or dyeing treatments. Applicant also argues that the combination of the references do not teach or disclose all of the Applicant's claim limitations in which the chelants are presented in the composition in the amounts of greater than 2% to about 4%.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above arguments because Dias et al. (US' 355) teaches a composition comprising seuestrant (chelant) agents of phosphonic acid

derivatives and wherein the chelants are most preferably present in the amounts of 0.05 to about 2% (see col. 24, lines 19-23). Therefore, if range of prior art (about 2%) and claimed range (greater than 2%) do not overlap, obviousness may still exist if the ranges are close enough that one would not expect a difference in properties, *In re Woodruff* 16 USPQ 2d 1934 (Fed. Cir 1990); *Titanium Metals Corp. V. Banner* 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Aller* 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA). Further, a prima facie case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties, see *Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner*, 778F.2d 775,227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985). See MPEP 2144.051. Furthermore, as the optimization of results, a patent will not be granted based upon the optimization of result effective variable when the optimization is obtained through routine experimentation unless there is a showing of unexpected results which properly rebuts the prima facie case of obviousness, see *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 276, 205 USPQ 215, 219 (CCPA 1980). See also *In re Woodruff*, 919 F. 2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936-37 (Fed. Cir. 1990), and *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Therefore, the prima facie case of obviousness has been established.

Furthermore, Applicant has not shown on record the criticality of the percentage amounts of the claimed chelants in the claimed composition over the composition of the prior art of record.

6 THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

Art Unit: 1751

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eisa B. Elhilo whose telephone number is (571) 272-1315. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F (8:00 -5:30) with alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on (571) 272-1029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Eisa Elhilo
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1751

March 22, 2006